

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCBN 9990)  
United States Attorney

DOUGLAS SPRAGUE (CSBN 202121 )  
Chief, Criminal Division

DENISE MARIE BARTON (MABN 634052)  
Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
San Francisco, California 94102  
Telephone: (415) 436-7359  
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234  
denise.barton@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	CR No. 03-07-70348 BZ
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
	)	EXCLUDING TIME
v.	)	
	)	
GILSON ARAUJO aka GILVAN	)	
LEANDRO THOMAZELE,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

On July 30, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from July 30, 2007 through August 14, 2007. The parties represented that The Government has and is continuing to provide discovery to the defendant. Further, counsel for the Government and defense counsel are currently discussing pre-indictment resolution of this matter. Finally, counsel for the defendant does not believe it is within his client's best interest to hold a preliminary hearing within 10 days, pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 5.1(c),(d). The parties represent that granting this continuance is necessary for effective preparation of counsel to permit defense counsel to review discovery and

1 to afford counsel time to discuss pre-indictment resolution, taking into account the exercise of  
2 due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

3 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

4  
5 SCOTT N. SCHOOLS  
6 United States Attorney

7 DATED: July 30, 2007

8 /s/  
9 DENISE MARIE BARTON  
Assistant United States Attorney

10 DATED: July 30, 2007

11 /s/  
12 ALAN DRESSLER  
Attorney for GILSON ARAUJO aka  
13 GILVAN LEANDRO THOMAZELE

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 As the Court found on July 30, 2007, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that  
16 the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the  
17 defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act  
18 calculations from July 30, 2007 through August 14, 2007 for effective preparation of counsel.  
19 See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny the  
20 defendant continuity of counsel and effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the  
21 exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C.  
22 §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

23  
24  
25 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 Honorable James Larson  
28 United States Magistrate Judge